UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/729,638	12/01/2000	Dale McNulty	259/075	3045

7590   10/20/2004

MORLAND C FISCHER
2030 MAIN STREET
SUITE 1050
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER
STRANGE, AARON N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/729,638	MCNULTY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aaron Strange	2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2004*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
    closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01 December 2000* is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
            application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01022001*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings, Figures 1-7, are objected to because the blocks are not

labeled with appropriate legends. A proposed drawing correction or corrected

drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the

application. The objection to the drawing will not be held in abeyance.

Double Patenting

2.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially
created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as
to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude"
granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.
See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re
Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686
F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164
USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644
(CCPA 1969).
       A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may
be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory
double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to
be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).
       Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may
sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must
fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.   Claims 1,6,9, and 25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,36,47,

and 52 of copending Application No. 09/694,642 in view of Ainsworth et al. (US

6,728,788). Table 1 below highlights the differences between the claims.

4.   Claims 12,17, and 20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11,14, and

23 of copending Application No. 09/724,779 in view of Ainsworth et al. (US

6,728,788). Table 2 below highlights the differences between the claims.

Present Application	Copending Application #09/694,642
Claim 1 – Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 1
Claim 6 - Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 36
Claim 9 - Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 47
Claim 25 - Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 52

Table 1: Present Application vs. Application #09/694,642

Present Application	Copending Application #09/724,779
Claim 12 – Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 11
Claim 17 - Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 14
Claim 20 - Client and server are located on the same machine	Claim 23

Table 2: Present Application vs. Application #09/724,779

5.   Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The primary difference between the claims is the placement of the client and the customization server on the same machine in claims 1,12,17,20,36,47, and 52 of the present application.

Ainsworth et al. (Ainsworth, hereafter) discloses a system for converting remote procedure calls to local procedure calls (Ainsworth, Col 7, Lines 5-13). This removes significant communication overhead when the client and server are located on the same machine (Ainsworth, Col 13, Lines 14-28). Placing the client and server on the same machine would also significantly reduce the communication delay between the two since procedure calls do not need to propagate across a telecommunications network. Placing the client and customization server on the same machine would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls as disclosed by Ainsworth, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the client and the customization server on the same machine. This would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for
all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

7.   Claims 1,4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US
6,728,788).

8.   With regard to claim 1, Burner et al. (Burner, hereafter) discloses a
computer-implemented system for the dynamic customization of user-requested
content, the system comprising: a network-connected client having a browser
that sends a user request for a content item (web page) belonging to a category
to the network (Col 2, Lines 42-50); a customization server platform connected to
the network, the customization server receiving the request for the content item,
the customization server platform comprising: an information source having the
content item (archive database) (Col 2, Lines 27-30); an application program
(metadata server) specifying a taxonomy of the relationship of content items
(Web pages) and actions (return related web pages) based upon their categories
(Col 3, Lines 27-38); and a rules and action module having an action belonging
to the category (return related web pages) and a rule for invoking the action upon
identification of the receipt of a requested content item having the same category

as the action (Col 3, Lines 27-38). However, Burner fails to disclose that the network-connected client and the customization server platform are located on the same machine.

Ainsworth et al. (Ainsworth, hereafter) discloses a system for converting remote procedure calls to local procedure calls (Ainsworth, Col 7, Lines 5-13). This removes significant communication overhead when the client and server are located on the same machine (Ainsworth, Col 13, Lines 14-28). Placing the client and server on the same machine would also significantly reduce the communication delay between the two since procedure calls do not need to propagate across a telecommunications network. Placing the client and customization server on the same machine would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls as disclosed by Ainsworth, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the client and the customization server on the same machine. This would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

9.   With regard to claim 4, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

10.   With regard to claim 5, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

11.   Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in further view of Applicant's admission.

12.   With regard to claims 2 and 3 Burner further discloses a group number identifying a group of sites or have common features (Col 16, Lines 38-46). A categorizer is required to generate the appropriate group number for a given site and the appropriate metadata to associate with it. Therefore, a categorizer for identifying the category (group number) of the content item and the action (metadata to return) is present, despite the lack of a specific reference to one. However, Burner fails to disclose the specific location of the categorizer.

Applicant admits on Page 8, Lines 20-24 of the present application that "The location of the categorizer is a design choice for those skilled in the art, and is not critical to the invention". Combining a server and client or using them separately are both well-known methods and function equally well.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to either place the categorizer on the same machine as the client or in a dedicated hardware device. The choice of either method is a design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

13.   Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in further view of Handel et al. (US 6,195,651).

14.   With regard to claim 6, while the invention disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed regarding Claim 1), it fails to disclose the use and storage of user personas rather than requests for content.

Handel et al. teach the use of user personas containing rules and restrictions as a means for specifying the type of content a particular user wishes to receive when they are using a given persona. The use of personas allows the user to have content customized for the persona, such as a work persona or home persona, providing information relevant to the user based upon the rules set forth in the persona (Handel et al. Col 31, Line 45 to Col 32, Line 41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize user personas and store them in the database server provided in the system disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth in order to allow a user to specify the content type they would like to receive. Allowing the user to specify a persona which determines the types of content desired allows the system to provide more accurate content since the content types desired are explicitly stated via the persona.

15.   With regard to claim 7, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

16.   With regard to claim 8, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

17.   Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788).

18.   With regard to claim 9, Burner discloses a computer-implemented system

for the dynamic customization of user-requested content, the system comprising:

a network-connected client having a browser that sends a user request for a

content item (web page) belonging to a category to the network (Col 2, Lines 42-

50); a customization server platform connected to the network, the customization

server platform comprising: an information source having the content item

(database server) (Col 2, Lines 27-30); an application program (metadata server)

specifying a taxonomy of the relationship of content items (Web pages) and

actions based upon their categories (return related web pages) (Col 3, Lines 27-

38); and an information retrieval module comprising a front-end application (web

crawler) for retrieving the content item and its linked category content (related

web pages) from a second information source on the network (Internet) and

storing the retrieved content in the first information source (database server) (Col

5, Lines 41-60). However, Burner fails to disclose that the network-connected

client and the customization server platform are located on the same machine.

        Ainsworth et al. (Ainsworth, hereafter) discloses a system for converting

remote procedure calls to local procedure calls (Ainsworth, Col 7, Lines 5-13).

This removes significant communication overhead when the client and server are

located on the same machine (Ainsworth, Col 13, Lines 14-28). Placing the client

and server on the same machine would also significantly reduce the

communication delay between the two since procedure calls do not need to

propagate across a telecommunications network. Placing the client and

customization server on the same machine would have allowed remote

procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls as disclosed by

Ainsworth, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls,

speeding up the performance of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to place the client and the customization server

on the same machine. This would have allowed remote procedure calls to be

converted to local procedure calls, as well as reduced the communication delay

for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

19.   With regard to claim 10, Burner further discloses that the network-

connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

20.   With regard to claim 11, Burner further discloses that the network-

connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

21.   Claims 12,15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al.

(US 6,728,788).

22.   With regard to claim 12, Burner discloses a computer-implemented

system for the dynamic customization of user-requested content, the system

comprising: a network-connected client having a second application program

(browser) that sends a user request for a content item (web page) belonging to a

category to the network (Col 2, Lines 42-50); a customization server platform

connected to the network, the customization server receiving the request for the content item, the customization server platform comprising: an information source having the content item (archive database) (Col 2, Lines 27-30); an application program (metadata server) specifying a taxonomy of the relationship of content items (Web pages) and actions (return related web pages) based upon their categories (Col 3, Lines 27-38); and a rules and action module having an action belonging to the category (return related web pages) and a rule for invoking the action upon identification of the receipt of a requested content item having the same category as the action (Col 3, Lines 27-38). However, Burner fails to disclose that the network-connected client and the customization server platform are located on the same machine.

Ainsworth et al. (Ainsworth, hereafter) discloses a system for converting remote procedure calls to local procedure calls (Ainsworth, Col 7, Lines 5-13). This removes significant communication overhead when the client and server are located on the same machine (Ainsworth, Col 13, Lines 14-28). Placing the client and server on the same machine would also significantly reduce the communication delay between the two since procedure calls do not need to propagate across a telecommunications-network. Placing the client and customization server on the same machine would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls as disclosed by Ainsworth, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the client and the customization server on the same machine. This would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

23.   With regard to claim 15, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

24.   With regard to claim 16, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

25.   Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in further view of Applicant's admission.

26.   With regard to claims 13 and 14 Burner further discloses a group number identifying a group of sites or have common features (Col 16, Lines 38-46). A categorizer is required to generate the appropriate group number for a given site and the appropriate metadata to associate with it. Therefore, a categorizer for identifying the category (group number) of the content item and the action (metadata to return) is present, despite the lack of a specific reference to one. However, Burner fails to disclose the specific location of the categorizer.

Applicant admits on Page 8, Lines 20-24 of the present application that "The location of the categorizer is a design choice for those skilled in the art, and

is not critical to the invention". Combining a server and client or using them

separately are both well-known methods and function equally well.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to either place the categorizer on the same

machine as the client or in a dedicated hardware device. The choice of either

method is a design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

27.   Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in

further view of Handel et al. (US 6,195,651).

28.   With regard to claim 17, while the invention disclosed by Burner in view of

Ainsworth shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed

regarding Claim 12), it fails to disclose the use and storage of user personas

rather than requests for content.

Handel et al. teach the use of user personas containing rules and

restrictions as a means for specifying the type of content a particular user wishes

to receive when they are using a given persona. The use of personas allows the

user to have content customized for the persona, such as a work persona or

home persona, providing information relevant to the user based upon the rules

set forth in the persona (Handel et al. Col 31, Line 45 to Col 32, Line 41).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to utilize user personas and store them in the

database server provided in the system disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth

in order to allow a user to specify the content type they would like to receive. Allowing the user to specify a persona which determines the types of content desired allows the system to provide more accurate content since the content types desired are explicitly stated via the persona.

29.   With regard to claim 18, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

30.   With regard to claim 19, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

31.   Claims 20,23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in further view of Gabber et al. (US 5,961,593).

32.   With regard to claim 20, while the invention disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed regarding Claim 1), it fails to disclose a network-connected subscriber server system having a third application program that forwards a user request for a content item belonging to a category to the network. Effectively, this server system behaves as a client in the system and requests content by forwarding the client request from the end user.

Gabber et al. teach the use of a proxy server for accessing the Internet. The proxy server acts accepts requests from the users and forwards them to the Internet, retrieves the requested content, and forwards it to the clients. Similar devices are well known in the art and used as proxy gateways and firewalls. The

proxy server acts as a client on the Internet when making the requests.

Responding servers reply to the proxy and have no knowledge of the ultimate

destination of the content. The proxy can forward the requested content to the

appropriate requesting clients. It would be advantageous to give this type of

capability to web servers in order to allow them to retrieve customized content on

behalf of the clients communicating with the web sites.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art

at the time the invention was made to allow a subscriber server system to be a

client in the system disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth and request related

web pages based upon the pages requested by its own clients. This would allow

the subscriber server system to receive a list of related links, and dynamically

place the links in the requested web page before returning it to the client. Since

the links are constantly updated by the system, they remain relevant and

functional at all times, updating to reflect appropriate changes in content.

33.   With regard to claim 23, Burner further discloses that the network-

connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

34.   With regard to claim 24, Burner further discloses that the network-

connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

35.   Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US

6,728,788) in further view of Gabber et al. (US 5,961,593) in further view of

Applicant's admission.

36.   With regard to claims 21 and 22 Burner further discloses a group number

identifying a group of sites or have common features (Col 16, Lines 38-46). A

categorizer is required to generate the appropriate group number for a given site

and the appropriate metadata to associate with it. Therefore, a categorizer for

identifying the category (group number) of the content item and the action

(metadata to return) is present, despite the lack of a specific reference to one.

However, Burner fails to disclose the specific location of the categorizer.

        Applicant admits on Page 8, Lines 20-24 of the present application that

"The location of the categorizer is a design choice for those skilled in the art, and

is not critical to the invention". Combining a server and client or using them

separately are both well-known methods and function equally well.

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to either place the categorizer on the same

machine as the client or in a dedicated hardware device. The choice of either

method is a design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art.

37.   Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Burner et al. (US 6,282,548) in view of Ainsworth et al. (US 6,728,788) in

further view of Bates et al. (US 5,907,681).

38.   With regard to claim 25, Burner discloses a computer-implemented

system for the dynamic auto-updating of the content on an information source

based on user-requested content, the system comprising: a network-connected

client having a browser that sends a user request for a content item (web page)

belonging to a category to the network (Col 2, Lines 42-50); a customization

server platform connected to the network, the customization server platform

comprising: an information source having the content item (database server) (Col

2, Lines 27-30); an application program (metadata server) specifying a taxonomy

of the relationship of content items (Web pages) and actions based upon their

categories (return related web pages) (Col 3, Lines 27-38); and an information

retrieval module comprising a front-end application (web crawler) for retrieving

the content item and its linked category content (related web pages) from a

second information source on the network (Internet) and storing the retrieved

content and linked category content in the first information source (database

server) (Col 5, Lines 41-60). However, Burner fails to disclose that the network-

connected client and the customization server platform are located on the same

machine.

Ainsworth et al. (Ainsworth, hereafter) discloses a system for converting

remote procedure calls to local procedure calls (Ainsworth, Col 7, Lines 5-13).

This removes significant communication overhead when the client and server are

located on the same machine (Ainsworth, Col 13, Lines 14-28). Placing the client

and server on the same machine would also significantly reduce the

communication delay between the two since procedure calls do not need to

propagate across a telecommunications network. Placing the client and

customization server on the same machine would have allowed remote

procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls as disclosed by

Ainsworth, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the client and the customization server on the same machine. This would have allowed remote procedure calls to be converted to local procedure calls, as well as reduced the communication delay for procedure calls, speeding up the performance of the system.

Burner also fails to disclose the use of version indicators for the content items or a back-end application program having a means for comparing the version indicator of the requested content item with the version indicator of the content item stored in the first information source, and sending a request for the URL of the content item when the version indicators do not match.

In an analogous art, Bates et al. teach the use of version indicators for requested web content as a means to determine if the pages have changed since the last cache update was made. A "last time refreshed" date stamp is used to determine the age of entries, and a CRC value is calculated for the stored content and compared with the CRC of the scanned page when the refresh interval has passed. If the CRC differs, the cached version is no longer valid and is updated (Col 5, Lines 29-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to anyone of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use version indicators for the content items in the system disclosed by Burner in view of Ainsworth and to add a back end program to compare the version indicator of the stored content with the version

indicator of the requested content, and subsequently request the URL of the content item if the version indicators do not match. This would ensure that the user would receive the most recent version of the content that is requested.

39.   With regard to claim 26, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a personal digital assistant (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

40.   With regard to claim 27, Burner further discloses that the network-connected client is a wireless device (cell phone) (Col 6, Lines 59-65).

41.   Claims 28-31 are rejected for the same reasons cited for claims 1-5, since the claims recite substantially the same subject matter and all limitations of claims 28-31 are met by the art cited in the rejections for claims 1-5.

42.   Claims 32-35 are rejected for the same reasons cited for claims 12-16, since the claims recite substantially the same subject matter and all limitations of claims 32-35 are met by the art cited in the rejections for claims 12-16.

43.   Claims 36-39 are rejected for the same reasons cited for claims 20-24, since the claims recite substantially the same subject matter and all limitations of claims 36-39 are met by the art cited in the rejections for claims 20-24.

Conclusion

44.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron Strange whose telephone number is 703-305-8878. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 703-305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ANS 9/1/2004 .

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100